# FUNNY WORLD

FUNNY WORLD, #4, January 1967. Published monthly for distribution with CAPA-alpha by Mike Barrier, 5813 Hawthorne Road, Little Rock, Arkansas 72207.

## A "NEW LOOK" FOR FUNNY WORLD

Next issue will see a change in FUNNY WORLD. It will become a little more a regular "fanzine" and a little less an "apa-zine." About all this means is that the K-a business--mailing comments, proposals for changes in the constitution, other comments directed to the K-a membership--will be strictly separated from the other material in the magazine. Articles, checklists and the like will be at front of the magazine, and free of "in-group" references. FW will also have an illustrated cover from now on.

The basic reason for these changes is that FW is going to an increasing number of people who are not members of K-a and aren't at all likely to join. The "in-group" material scattered throughout the magazine has annoyed some of them, which I can understand. K-alphans will benefit from the change, too, since my writing and research should improve under the pressure of working for a more "general" audience.

What this doesn't mean is that FW is on the way to becoming a regular, paid-subscription sort of "fanzine." That I can do without. I want to preserve the informal, trial-run character of FW while better serving the "funny-animal" fans whose interests are ignored by most "fanzines." While I'm not going to ask for subscriptions, there are two things I want to ask of the non-K-alphans who are receiving FW. The first is for help with the postage, which is becoming burdensome. If you want to continue receiving FW, you will, whether or not you send any stamps, but I'd appreciate the help. On the other hand, if you're receiving FW and could care less, it would help if you told me that. The other request is for permission to reprint letters about FW in a letter column. A number of people have had some very interesting things to say, but I haven't felt free to print them. I particularly regret not asking Dick Lupoff for permission to print parts of his letter about FW #1. So, take this as warning: if, in the future, you write me about FW, I'll take it for granted that I can print your letter, unless you say something to the contrary.

Come to think of it, if anyone has written or wants to write an article/essay about any of the "funny animals," you might submit it to FUNNY WORLD. Filling eight pages a month by myself is no burden now, but it may become such in the near future.

- * -

NEXT ISSUE will probably contain a brief, not-too-serious article about the "ambiguity" of many "funny-animal" characters. As I'll demonstrate, it's frequently hard to tell if a "funny animal" is a human who looks like an animal, or an animal who behaves like a human, or some other mixed-up something in between.

"WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THERE IS NO MORE WALT DISNEY?"

> "I think about that," he said. "Every day I'm throwing more responsibility to other men. Every day I'm trying to organize them more strongly.
>
> "But I'll probably outlive them all," he grinned. "I'm 61. I've got everything I started out with except my tonsils, and that's above average. I plan to be around for a while."
>
> NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, August 1963

For a while, it was hard for me to believe Walt Disney was really dead, he's been a part of me so long.

First, as a name, from the time my parents carried me screaming from the theater during the forest fire sequence in "Bambi" (my earliest memory of any kind). Later, as a middle-aged man with a mustache (I dug mustaches when I was a kid; I was for Tom Dewey in 1948 because he wore a mustache a d had the same name as one of Donald Duck's nephews). And finally, of course, as a personality, with the debut of the "Disneyland" TV show in 1954.

It seems a little odd, that Walt Disney should have become more familiar as a public personality at the same time as the "Walt Disney" name acquired an institutional ring. I feel some curiosity about who will host the "Wonderful World of Color" now (some Hollywood name, no doubt), but I feel no curiosity about what the Disney product will be like without Disney around. It'll be more of the same sort of stuff, that's all, no worse and probably no better.

The creative Walt Disney died a long time ago, in other words, unless you weigh the Disneyland park in the same scale as the animated cartoons. Bosley Crowther summed it up best, in an "appraisal" in the New York TIMES that accompanied what was probably the best Disney obituary.

> As a weaver of juvenile fancies with his anthropomorphic cartoons, which turned out to be as delightful to grown-ups as they were to the young, Mr. Disney was toiling in the medium that gave him the greatest joy and stimulated his inventiveness and skill to its finest works. There isn't much question among artists that his most original and tasteful films were his animated shorts made in the nineteen-thirties, when he was still fairly diffident and benign.
>
> * * * [Snow White] was successful. But it marked a major departure in Mr. Disney's work. * * * It marked his fateful migration into a new and less personal fantasy realm. He began working with the stories of other people--old familiar ones mostly--and he took to a kind of representational animation that was not esthetically felicitous. Not to him.

True...but Joseph Morgenstern, in NEWSWEEK, also said something worth repeating.

> Children still flock to see the Disney live-actior pictures with Fred MacMurray or Hayley Mills or a levitating Model T, but they will never know the awe, the sublime wonder that Disney's full-length

> cartoons inspired in children who sat in those darkened dream-palaces in the dear days before television.

Yes, indeed. Most people under 35 and over 20 have memories of that sort, probably. I remember weeping with Uncle Remus at Bobby Driscoll's bedside when I was six years old, and I remember the awe I felt when I went with my brother one raw March afternoon to see "Fantasia" at a neighborhood theater. Stravinsky may have criticized one performance of "The Rite of Spring" as "duller than Disney's dying dinosaurs," but there was nothing dull about them that day. I wouldn't weep with Uncle Remus now, and I felt no awe when I saw "Fantasia" for the third time a couple of years ago. Still, the memories are precious. The short cartoons were better, but the features did have a magic of their own.

I thought while watching that first posthumous Disney television show that it was ironic that Chet Huntley should describe a 60-minute commercial for Disneyland as "the most fitting tribute" to Disney's memory. Ironic, and sad, and probably correct. In a way, the Dr. Seuss special that preceded the "Wonderful World of Color" on another network was a much more fitting tribute, since it is the best long cartoon since the best Disneys. What Chuck Jones has decided to do, I hope is to mine that part of the Disney legacy that other cartoonists,have largely ignored, to their discredit. Like Disney, Chuck Jones in "How the Grinch Stole Christmas" emphasized the personalities of his characters over all else. The Grinch's wonderful face was explored with loving care, and no scowl or smile went to waste. This approach is probably as much a matter of economics as of art--animating a face is probably cheaper than animating several characters in action--but Jones is till doing the right thing. The cartoons of most producers are junkbags full of stale gags, but a cartoon which explores a human personality reflected in a Donald Duck--or a Grinch--can be an almost endless source of pleasure. Blessings on thee, Messrs. Jones and Geisel, and thank you for the finest memorial to Walt Disney.

If you want a truly beautiful and lasting memento of Walt Disney and his work--and you should--send a check for $5.95 to Golden Press, North Road, Poughkeepsie, New York, and ask for THE ART OF ANIMATION, by Bob Thomas and the Walt Disney Studio (#40840). This book was first published in 1959 by Simon and Schuster, essentially as a promotion piece for "Sleeping Beauty." It was in and out of the catalog very quickly. Golden Press has now reissued it, with an updated listing of the Disney Oscars and Emmies, and a somewhat sturdier binding. Since the two editions are identical in all other respects, the Golden Press edition is to be preferred. The illustrations alone are worth the price--there are dozens of stills from the movies, model sheets, preliminary sketches of all sorts, and many, many photographes and charts and such that show how an animated cartoon is put together. There's a listing of credits at the back of the book for all the Disney features through "Sleeping Beauty." The Bob Thomas text is also excellent, for all that it bears the Disney imprimatur. This is certainly the best book on Disney--far superior to THE ART OF WALT DISNEY by Robert D. Feild (1942), a well-illustrated but terribly written book. THE ART OF ANIMATION may even be the best book on animation, but whether it is or not, it's worth your $5.95. Buy.

- * -

QUESTIONS...

(20) Did any of the Leon Schlesinger/Warner Bros. Cartoons characters make any comic-book appearances before the publication of LOONEY TUNES #1 in the summer of 1941?

(21) There is no YOGI BEAR #4 listed in the Catalog of Copyright Entries. However, only three issues of YOGI BEAR were published in the Four Color series before YOGI BEAR #5, dated Oct.-Nov. 1961, was published. YB #4 could have been omitted from the Catalog by accident; or the fourth YB could have been a Four Color now listed as a blank on the Thompsons' list (perhaps #1217); or Dell could have just goofed, perhaps by counting as #4 one of the several YB one-shots published after the YB bi-monthly series began. Anyone able to clear this up?

(22) Similarly, there is no FLINTSTONES #1 listed in the Catalog of Copyright Entries. Entries in the Catalog begin with #2, Nov.-Dec. 1961. There was, however, a Flintstones giant published about four months earlier, and this may have been counted as #1. Or, as with YOGI BEAR, the Catalog could be in error, there could have been a Four Color not on the Thompsons' list, or Dell might have goofed. Again, anyone know for sure?

(23) What sort of comic-book appearances did Lassie (yes, the dog) make before Dell published LASSIE #1 in 1950?

...AND ANSWERS

(10) The Thompsons have suggested that I may have confused the Dell "Famous Stories" comic book with a "Famous Authors" comic book published by Seaboard Publishers Inc., but I don't think that this is the case. My information came from Bill Thailing's catalog; he lists a "Tom Sawyer" issue of "Famous Stories" and there was no "Tom Sawyer" issue of "Famous Authors."

(13) As Don Thompson mentioned in K-a #26, there was no "Albert and Bumbazine" strip in OUR GANG #5. That leaves #6.

- - - -

# MAILING COMMENTS

DAN ALDERSON (Barsh): I like Phil Castora's alternative presentation of the data in the Bails-Keltner INDEX. I like it so much, in fact, that I worked up a similar presentation of my own, using three years' issues of LOONEY TUNES that were handy. There are these differences from the Castora Supplement's format: (1) "vertical" rather than "horizontal" tables; (2) an issue-by-issue breakdown of features, and (3) abbreviations for the titles of all strips, instead of just some of them. The basic reason for (1), when you get right down to it, is that my typewriter won't take a stencil sideways. But I also think a "vertical" format is more efficient, for reasons that should be obvious after I've discussed (2) and (3).

As for (2), when a comic book's features change rapidly, as was true of many of the Dell comics in which I'm interested, you have to give what amounts to a de facto issue-by-issue breakdown, anyway, so there's no point in not going whole hog. Then too, an issue-by-issue breakdown gives a more accurate picture of "the chronological development of the pattern of features in each comic," since just by glancing at the tables, you can tell how one feature compared in longevity with another. You can't quite do this with the Castora Supplement, since one line may represent a dozen issues, and another line only one. Of course, you can't give an issue-by-issue breakdown using a horizontal layout; it would eat up too many pages. So you've got to use a vertical layout, and that in turn means you've got to use abbreviations for all titles, my point (3). But as Phil's footnotes show, abbreviations are unavoidable whatever you do, so you might as well go all the way. One further consideration: Phil's data for SENSATION and STAR-SPANGLED fit neatly onto one page for each title. But what about comics that aren't as tractable, and insist on spilling over onto two pages? Seems to me that a vertical format permits greater flexibility in handling such problems.

Comic books weren't published with indexers in mind, which can lead to problems. It's hard to decide what the "cover feature" is, for example, without adopting some arbitrary rule. This is especially true of a comic like LOONEY TUNES, where the same characters appear in many of the strips, and frequently appear together on the cover. I adopted a "principal character" rule, listing as the cover feature the character most prominently displayed on the cover, even when other characters were shown with him. Two cover features were listed only when two characters were given equal prominence, which happened only twice, the way I applied the test. Another obvious problem is, how long does a strip have to be before you count it? I counted all strips of more than a page...but what would I do with all those comic-strip reprints in the early issues of WALT DISNEY'S COMICS? What about those early Dell Four Colors that consisted of nothing but reprints of Sunday pages? In other words, it's virtually impossible to devise a format that will cover every conceivable case. This is especially true when you're dealing with comics like the Dells, which vary so widely. For the record, a "real" LOONEY TUNES index would not look quite like the index on the next page, since the data for #99-134 would have to be adjusted to match up with the data for the issues that preceded and followed them. It would probably take at least six pages to cover all 246 issues. As here, all abbreviations and notes covering issues listed on a particular page in a "real" index would be at the bottom of that page.

## LOONEY TUNES #99-134

| ISSUE | DATE | FEATURES | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99 | 1/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 100 | 2/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 101 | 3/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 102 | 4/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 103 | 5/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 104 | 6/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 105 | 7/50 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | | | |
| 106 | 8/50 | BB | | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 107 | 9/50 | BB | | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 108 | 10/50 | BB | | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 109 | 11/50 | BB | | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 110 | 12/50 | BB | | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 111 | 1/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 112 | 2/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 113 | 3/51 | BB | SMJ | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 114 | 4/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 115 | 5/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 116 | 6/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 117 | 7/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | Syl | | |
| 118 | 8/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | S&T | | |
| 119 | 9/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | S&T | | |
| 120 | 10/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EF | S&T | | |
| 121 | 11/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | S&T | | |
| 122 | 12/51 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | | | |
| 123 | 1/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | | | |
| 124 | 2/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | | | |
| 125 | 3/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFDD | | | |
| 126 | 4/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFDD | | | |
| 127 | 5/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | | | |
| 128 | 6/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFDD | | | |
| 129 | 7/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | | | |
| 130 | 8/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | T&S | LPV | |
| 131 | 9/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | T&S | LPV | Pet |
| 132 | 10/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | T&S | LPV | Pet |
| 133 | 11/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | T&S | LPV | Pet |
| 134 | 12/52 | BB | MJS | PP | HH | EFD | T&S | LPV | |

The cover feature is underlined. Abbreviations: Bugs Bunny; Sniffles & Mary Jane; Porky Pig; Henery Hawk; Elmer Fudd; Sylvester; Mary Jane & Sniffles; Sylvester & Tweety; Elmer Fudd and Daffy; Elmer Fudd and Daffy Duck; Tweety & Sylvester; Little Pancho Vanilla; Petunia. There was a "Sniffles and Mary Jane" text story in #106-110; the title was changed to "Mary Jane and Sniffles" with #110.

Any suggestions on how this ALTERNATIVE to the format of Phil Castora's SUPPLEMENT to AN AUTHORITATIVE INDEX TO DC COMICS by Howard Keltner and Jerry Bails could be improved?

Before I continue with mailing comments on K-a #26, this plea: if any "special," Sunday-magazine-type articles about Walt Disney turn up in your local papers, I'd very much like to have copies. I'll be happy to reimburse you for any costs involved. And along the same lines, I understand that the British papers gave extensive coverage to Disney's death. Can anyone suggest the best way to obtain copies?

GATEWAY COMIC ART FAN CLUB: INFERIOR FIVE is a bad comic book, but it's not bad because Charles Eichler doesn't like it. That's the gist of his argument: INFERIOR FIVE is no good because it grates against Charles Eichler's highly refined tastes. Yeah.

GARY MASON (Bramston): What I said about the first installment of your censorship series still goes. What you've done, essentially, is put together an excellent set of source materials for a 7-8 page article on Australian censorship, with the emphasis on the censorship of comics. I hope you'll write it, and submit it to COMIC ART or DOWN UNDER or a similar "fanzine."

JOHN RYAN (Boomerang): I now agree with you on listing only the top four in the "Egoboo Poll." We're getting such a vigorous exchange of mailing comments that I no longer see any need for publishing the complete standings.

DENNIS RICHARD (Chatter): Are you typing on stencils without films, or is your typewriter defective, or what? The results aren't pleasing, whatever it is you're doing. I'm interested in a lot of what you have to say, but I wish it were just a little easier to read.

FRED PATTEN (Heavy Water): Now that TIME has told us something about "Asterix le Gaulois" (in the December 23 issue), let's hear some more about the character from you.

AL KUHFELD (Pangolin): Well, as you know by now, I've retracted some of my more extreme statements in FW #1. That's one of the nice things about K-a; you can pop off and then contradict yourself without feeling embarassed. I liked, and still like, "Mary Jane and Sniffles," and a very occasional re-reading only reinforces the affection I feel for the strip. Familiarity breeds contempt, though, and too-frequent readings would dull that affection very quickly. This means I've lost my "sense of wonder," I suppose, but I'm not sure I ever had it. Comics I really loved when I was a kid, I still love, and can read again and again without any diminution of my enthusiasm. The discovery of some flaw in, say, Carl Barks' technique is always more than balanced by the discovery of something like a brilliantly handled panel which I had overlooked before. The comics I only liked when I was a kid--such as MJ&S--I still only like. I read them now less than I did then, because my tastes have broadened, if not necessarily improved. ## I don't dislike high school sophomores as individuals, I dislike them as a group, as we Southrons always say about minority groups we're persecuting. I don't object to the kids because their enthusiasm is, in all too many cases, witless, but because witless enthusiasm has become the state of fandom as a whole. (Witless cynicism, of the "Green Rabbit's Hutch"

variety is just the other side of this coin.) This is no good. Why? Well, take this example. Bill Spicer wants to double the size of fandom, to 4,000-5,000. Most of these new members would be kids, of course, but a goodly number of them would subscribe to FANTASY ILLUSTRATED, and with a larger circulation, Bill could take on some projects he now can't afford. But if he published some of the most mature, beautiful, genuinely artistic strips ever in print, would anyone notice? Probably not, for the same reason that a lot of other mature, beautiful, genuinely artistic strips have gone unnoticed: "That stuff's for kids." And the people who said that would be right, wouldn't they?

DON ° MAGGIE (Rainy Days): Are you sure Kaler didn't send you one of his CAPTAIN ATOM scripts instead of an Alley ballot? As silly and complicated as your "ballot" sounds, that must be the case. ## It's very pleasant to hear some kind words for ROY ROGERS COMICS, but don't forget Albert Micale's art. It was especially appropriate for a Western comic book. ## Tubby Tompkins is quite right about TINT, but I believe he said, "stark, bare naked nood," not "stark, staring, bare-nekkid NOOD!" That's what he said in the March 1952 LITTLE LULU, anyway. Maybe you had some other issue in mind. Let's have Maggie's "review" of TINT; maybe Rick Weingroff will listen if he's told often enough and loud enough that he's wasting his talents on such garbage. ## It's fine with me if you comment on the current issue of K-a; it spices things up, as a matter of fact. And I'm sure it would be frustrating to have to hold your tongue when confronted with an illegible KAM or an unintelligible UNDER THE ARCH. ## The Stan Lee strip about a postman was "Willie Lumpkin." It stunk. ## After reading the February issue, I've decided WALT DISNEY'S COMICS isn't being killed by stupidity; it must be a plot. "Mickey Mouse," not a popular strip, is given good art, decent scripts, and the lead spot in the book. "Donald Duck," a very popular strip under all but the worst conditions, is given bad art, terrible scripts and a seat in the back of the bus. I wonder if WALT DISNEY'S COMICS scared Del Connell when he was a child. ## I can't understand for the life of me how using adult voices for "Peanuts" TV shows could be called "basically dishonest," at least so long as no effort was made to hide the fact that they were adult voices. But if using adult voices is "dishonest" per se, then isn't the strip itself dishonest? The kids in "Peanuts" think, talk and behave in adult terms; real children don't. Snoopy behaves like a human being in every way except speaking, which isn't true of any "real" dog I've ever run across (excepting Lassie and perhaps DC's Rex the Wonder Dog, who "thought" in good English). On the other hand, I've never heard the "Peanuts" record of a few years back, which is probably what you have in mind.

SHERMAN AND WAYNE HOWARD (Fantabulon): Surprise you though it may, I'll readily agree that FANTASTIC FOUR is the best comic book around today. It's one of the very few comic books I actually look forward to reading, the others being MELVIN MONSTER, THIRTEEN, UNCLE SCROOGE and MAGNUS, not necessarily in that order. ## I read the synopsis for your serial, "Mightier than the Sword," and it sounds like a delightful satire. I don't want to risk reading Chapter Two and finding out I'm supposed to take it seriously. Like John Ryan, I have a very low tolerance for fan fiction. I did read one chapter of the "Victor Baron" serial in JEDDAK, and I enjoyed it, but I don't want to press my luck.

- * -